arXiv:1703.02907v2 [math.ST] 9 Mar 2017

Improved bounds for Square-Root Lasso and Square-Root Slope

Alexis Derumigny*

March 10, 2017

Abstract

We show that two estimators, the Square-Root Lasso and the Square-Root Slope can achieve the exact optimal minimax prediction rate, which is $(s/n)\log(p/s)$ in the setting of the sparse high-dimensional linear regression. Here, n is the sample size, p is the dimension and s is the sparsity parameter. We also prove optimality for the estimation error in the l_q-norm, with $q \in [1, 2]$ for the Square-Root Lasso, and in the l_2 and sorted l_1 norms for the Square-Root Slope. Both estimators are adaptive to the unknown variance of the noise. The Square-Root Slope is also adaptive to the sparsity s of the true parameter. Moreover, in both cases, the chosen tuning parameters are independent of the confidence level under which the rate is valid, and we obtain improved concentration properties as in [1] where the case of known variance is treated. Our results are non-asymptotic.

MCS: Primary 62G08; secondary 62C20, 62G05.

Keywords: Sparse linear regression, Minimax rates, High-dimensional statistics, Adaptivity.

1 Introduction

In a recent paper by Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [1], it is shown that there exist high-dimensional statistical methods realisable in polynomial time that achieve the minimax optimal rate $(s/n)\log(p/s)$ in the context of sparse linear regression. Here, n is the sample size, p is the dimension and s is the sparsity parameter. The result is achieved by the Lasso and Slope estimators, and the Slope estimator is adaptive to the unknown sparsity s. Bounds for more general estimators are proved by Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [2, 3]. These articles also establish bounds in deviation that hold for any confidence level and for the risk in expectation. However, the estimators considered in [1–3] require the knowledge of the noise variance σ^2. To our knowledge, no polynomial-time methods, which would be at the same time optimal in a minimax sense and adaptive both to σ and s are available in the literature.

Estimators similar to the Lasso, but adaptive to σ are the Square-Root Lasso and the related Scaled Lasso, introduced by Sun and Zhang [12] and Belloni, Chernozhukov and

*ENSAE-CREST, 3 avenue Pierre-Larousse, 92245 Malakoff cedex, France. alexis.derumigny@ensae.fr

Wang [4]. It has been shown to achieve the rate $(s/n)\log(p)$ in deviation with the value of the tuning parameter depending on the confidence level. A variant of this estimator is the Heteroscedastic Square-Root Lasso, which is studied in more general nonparametric and semiparametric setups by Belloni, Chernozhukov and Wang [5], but it also achieves the rate $(s/n)\log(p)$ and depends on the confidence level. We refer to the book by Giraud [8] for the link between the Lasso and the Square-Root Lasso and a short proof of oracle inequalities for the Square-root Lasso. In summary, there are two points to improve for the Square-root Lasso method:

(i) The available results on oracle inequalities are valid only for the estimators depending on the confidence level. Thus, one cannot have an oracle inequality for one given estimator at any confidence level except the one that was used to design it.

(ii) The obtained rate is $(s/n)\log(p)$ which is greater than the minimax rate $(s/n)\log(p/s)$.

The Slope, which is an acronym for Sorted L-One Penalized Estimation, is an estimator introduced by Bogdan et al. [7], that is close to the Lasso, but uses the sorted l_1 norm instead of the standard l_1 norm for penalization. Su and Candès [11] proved that, as opposed to the Lasso, the Slope estimator is asymptotically minimax, in the sense that it attains the rate $(s/n)\log(p/s)$ for two isotropic designs, that is either for $\mathbb{X}$ deterministic with $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{X}^T\mathbb{X} = I$ or when $\mathbb{X}$ is a matrix with i.i.d. standard normal entries. General isotropic random designs are explored by Lecué and Mendelson [9]. For non-isotropic random designs and deterministic designs under conditions close to the Restricted Eigenvalue, the behavior of the Slope is studied in [1]. The Slope estimator is adaptive only to s, and requires knowledge of σ, which is not available in practice. In order to have an estimator which is adaptive both to s and σ, we will use the Square-Root Slope, introduced by Stucky and van de Geer [10]. They give oracle inequalities for a large group of square-root estimators, including the new Square-Root Slope, but still following the scheme where (i) and (ii) cannot be avoided.

In this paper, we prove two results. In Section 3, we show that the Square-Root Lasso is minimax optimal if s is known while being adaptive to σ under a mild condition on the design matrix (SRE). In Section 4, we study the Square-Root Slope estimator, and show that it is minimax optimal and adaptive both to s and σ, under a slightly stronger condition (WRE). The (SRE) and (WRE) conditions have already been studied by Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [1] and hold with high probability for a large class of random matrices. Moreover, both estimators are independent of the confidence level. Proofs are given in Section 5.

2 The framework

We use the notation $|\cdot|_q$ for the l_q norm, with $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $|\cdot|_0$ for the number of non-zero coordinates of a given vector. For any $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and any set of coordinates J, we denote by v_J the vector $(v_j \mathbb{1}\{i \in J\})_{i=1,\dots,p}$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function. We also define the empirical norm of a vector $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ as $||u||_n^2 := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2$. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote by $v_{(j)}$ the j-th largest component of v. As a particular case, $|v|_{(j)}$ is the j-th largest component of the vector $|v|$ whose components are the absolute values of the components of v. We use

the notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the inner product with respect to the Euclidean norm and $(e_j)_{j=1,\dots,p}$ for the canonical basis in $\mathbb{R}^p$.

Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vector of observations and let $\mathbb{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be the design matrix. We assume that the true model is the following

$$Y = \mathbb{X}\beta_0 + \varepsilon. \tag{1}$$

Here $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the unknown true parameter. We assume that ε is the random noise, with values in $\mathbb{R}^n$, distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{n\times n})$, where $I_{n\times n}$ is the identity matrix. In the high-dimensional framework, we have typically in mind the case where s is small, p is large and possibly $p \gg n$.

We define two square-root type estimators of β_0: the Square-Root Lasso $\hat{\beta}^{SQL}$ and the Square-Root Slope $\hat{\beta}^{SQS}$ by the following relations

$$\hat{\beta}^{SQL} \in \arg\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |Y - \mathbb{X}\beta|_2 + \mu |\beta|_1 \right), \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{\beta}^{SQS} \in \arg\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |Y - \mathbb{X}\beta|_2 + |\beta|_* \right), \tag{3}$$

where $\mu > 0$ is a tuning parameter to be chosen, and the sorted l_1 norm, $|\cdot|_*$, is defined for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by $|u|_* = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_j |u|_{(j)}$, with tuning parameters $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_p > 0$.

3 Optimal rates for the Square-Root Lasso

In this section, we derive oracle inequalities with optimal rate for the Square-Root Lasso estimator. We will use the *Strong Restricted Eigenvalue* (SRE) condition, introduced in [1]. For $c_0 > 0$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, it is defined as follows,

$SRE(s, c_0)$ **condition :** *The design matrix $\mathbb{X}$ satisfies $\max_{j=1,\dots,p} ||\mathbb{X}e_j||_n \leq 1$ and*

$$\kappa := \min_{\delta \in C_{SRE}(s,c_0): \delta \neq 0} \frac{||\mathbb{X}\delta||_n}{|\delta|_2} > 0, \tag{4}$$

where $C_{SRE}(s, c_0) := \{\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p : |\delta|_1 \leq (1 + c_0)\sqrt{s}|\delta|_2\}$ is a cone in $\mathbb{R}^p$.

The condition $\max_{j=1,\dots,p} ||\mathbb{X}e_j||_n \leq 1$ is standard and corresponds to a normalization. It is shown in [1] that the SRE condition is equivalent to the Restricted Eigenvalue (RE) condition of [6] if that is considered in conjunction with such a normalization. The SRE condition is satisfied with high probability for a large class of deterministic or random design matrices, see Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [1] for a discussion.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $s \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and assume that the $SRE(s, 5/3)$ condition holds. Choose the following tuning parameter*

$$\mu = \gamma \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)}, \tag{5}$$

and assume that

$$\gamma \geq 16 + 4\sqrt{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right) \leq \min\left(\frac{3\kappa^2}{256\gamma^2}, \frac{1}{4\gamma^2}\right). \tag{6}$$

Then, for every $\delta_0 \geq (p/s)^{-s}$ *and every* $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ *such that* $|\beta_0|_0 \leq s$*, with probability at least* $1 - \delta_0 - (1+e^2)e^{-n/24}$*, we have*

$$||\mathbb{X}(\hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0)||_n \leq \max\left(\frac{C_1}{\kappa^2}\ ,\ C_2\right)\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}, \tag{7}$$

$$|\hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0|_q \leq \max\left(\frac{C_3}{\kappa^2}\ ,\ C_4\right)\sigma s^{1/q}\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)}, \tag{8}$$

where $1 \leq q \leq 2$*, and* $C_1 > 0, C_2 > 0, C_3 > 0, C_4 > 0$ *are constants depending only on* γ*.*

This theorem gives bounds that hold with high probability for both the prediction error and the estimation error in the l_q norm, for every q in $[1,2]$. As shown in Section 7 of Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [1], these rates of estimation are optimal in a minimax sense on the set $\{\beta : |\beta|_0 \leq s\}$. As in [1], the tuning parameter μ that we propose does not depend on the level of confidence δ_0. Neither does it depend on the underlying standard deviation σ, which is unknown in practice. This gives an advantage for the Square-Root Lasso over other methods such as the ordinary Lasso. Nevertheless, this estimator is not adaptive to the sparsity s, so that we need the assumption $|\beta_0|_0 \leq s$ in order to be able to apply this method. The values of the constants C_1, C_2, C_3 and C_4 can be found in the proof, in Subsection 5.2.

4 Optimal rates for the Square-Root SLOPE

In this part, we will use another condition, the *Weighted Restricted Eigenvalue* condition, introduced in [1]. For $c_0 > 0$ and $s \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, it is defined as follows,

$WRE(s, c_0)$ **condition :** *The design matrix* $\mathbb{X}$ *satisfies* $\max_{j=1,\ldots,p} ||\mathbb{X}e_j||_n \leq 1$ *and*

$$\kappa' := \min_{\delta \in C_{WRE}(s,c_0):\delta \neq 0} \frac{||\mathbb{X}\delta||_n}{|\delta|_2} > 0, \tag{9}$$

where $C_{WRE}(s, c_0) := \{\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p : |\delta|_* \leq (1+c_0)|\delta|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2}\}$ *is a cone in* $\mathbb{R}^p$*.*

To obtain the following result, we assume that the Weighted Restricted Eigenvalue condition holds. This condition is shown to be only slightly more constraining than the usual Restricted Eigenvalue condition of [6], but is nevertheless satisfied with high probability for a large class of deterministic or random matrices, see Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [1] for a discussion.

Theorem 4.1 *Let* $s \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ *and assume that the* $WRE(s, 20)$ *condition holds. Choose the following tuning parameters*

$$\lambda_j = \gamma'\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/j)}{n}},\ \textit{for } j = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{10}$$

and assume that

$$\gamma' \geq 16 + 4\sqrt{2} \quad \textit{and} \quad \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2ep}{s}\right)} \leq \min\left(\frac{\kappa'}{16\gamma'}\ ,\ \frac{1}{2\gamma'}\right). \tag{11}$$

Then, for every $\delta_0 \geq (p/s)^{-s}$ and every $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $|\beta_0|_0 \leq s$, with probability at least $1 - \delta_0 - (1+e^2)e^{-n/24}$, we have

$$||\mathbb{X}(\hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0)||_n \leq \sigma \sqrt{\frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)} \max\left(\frac{C_1'}{\kappa'}, C_2'\right), \tag{12}$$

$$|\hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0|_* \leq \sigma \frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right) \max\left(\frac{C_1'}{\kappa'^2}, C_2'\right), \tag{13}$$

$$|\hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0|_2 \leq \sigma \sqrt{\frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)} \max\left(\frac{C_1'}{\kappa'^2}, C_2'\right), \tag{14}$$

for constants $C_1' > 0$ and $C_2' > 0$ depending only on γ'.

With this result, we have proved that the Square-Root Slope estimator, with such a choice of parameters, attains the optimal rate of convergence in the prediction norm $||\cdot||_n$ and in the estimation norm $|\cdot|_2$. We give also a bound on the sorted l_1 norm $|\cdot|_*$ of the estimation error. One can note that the choice of λ_i that allows us to obtain optimal bounds does not depend on the level of confidence δ_0. This improves upon the oracle result of Stucky and van de Geer [10], in which the parameter does depend on the level of confidence and the rate does not scale in the optimal way, i.e., as $\sqrt{(s/n)\log(p/s)}$. Moreover, we can see that our estimator is independent of the underlying standard deviation σ and of the sparsity s, even if the rates depend on them.

For this estimator, we did not provide a bound for the l_1 norm, for the same reasons as in [1]. Indeed, the coefficients λ_j of the components of β are different in the sorted norm. As a consequence, we do not provide inequalities for l_q norms when $q < 2$, that are obtained by interpolation between the l_1 and l_2 norms. The values of the constants C_1' and C_2' can be found in the proof, in Subsection 5.3.

5 Proofs

5.1 Preliminary lemmas

Let $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathcal{S} \subset \{1, \ldots, p\}$ with cardinality s and denote by $\mathcal{S}^C$ the complement of $\mathcal{S}$. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, let $\beta_{0,i}$ be the i-th component of β_0 and assume that for every $i \in \mathcal{S}^C$, $\beta_{0,i} = 0$.

Lemma 5.1 *We have* $|(\hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0)_{\mathcal{S}^C}|_1 \leq |(\hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0)_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + \dfrac{1}{\mu\sqrt{n}|\varepsilon|_2} \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T\varepsilon \, , \, \hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0 \right\rangle.$

The proof follows from the arguments in Giraud [8, pages 110-111], and it is therefore omitted.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be defined by $u := \hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0$. We have*

$$\sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}|\varepsilon|_2} \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T\varepsilon \, , \, u \right\rangle.$$

Proof : We combine the arguments from Giraud [8, pages 110-111], and from the proof of Lemma A.1 in [1]. First, we remark that the sorted l_1 norm can be written as follows, for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$|v|_* = \max_{\phi} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j \left| v_{\phi(j)} \right|,$$

where the maximum is taken over all permutations $\phi = (\phi(1), \ldots, \phi(p))$ of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$.

By definition, $\hat{\beta}^{SQS}$ is a minimizer of (3), so we have

$$|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}^{SQS}|_2 - |Y - \mathbb{X}\beta_0|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \left(|\beta_0|_* - |\hat{\beta}^{SQS}|_* \right).$$

Let ϕ be any permutation of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$ such that

$$|\beta_0|_* = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j |\beta_{0,\phi(j)}| \text{ and } |u_{\phi(s+1)}| \geq |u_{\phi(s+2)}| \geq \cdots \geq |u_{\phi(p)}|. \tag{15}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_0|_* - |\hat{\beta}^{SQS}|_* &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j \left(\left| \beta_{0,\phi(j)} \right| - \left| \hat{\beta}^{SQS}_{\phi(j)} \right| \right) - \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j \left| \hat{\beta}^{SQS}_{\phi(j)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j \left| u_{\phi(j)} \right| - \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j \left| \hat{\beta}^{SQS}_{\phi(j)} \right| = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j \left| u_{\phi(j)} \right| - \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j \left| u_{\phi(j)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since the sequence λ_j is non-increasing, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j |u_{\phi(j)}| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)}$. The permutation ϕ satisfies (15), therefore, $\sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} \leq \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j |u_{\phi(j)}|$. From the previous inequalities, we get that

$$|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}^{SQS}|_2 - |Y - \mathbb{X}\beta_0|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} - \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} \right). \tag{16}$$

By convexity of the mapping $\beta \mapsto ||Y - X\beta||_2$, we have

$$|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}^{SQS}|_2 - |Y - \mathbb{X}\beta_0|_2 \geq - \left\langle \frac{\mathbb{X}^T \varepsilon}{|\varepsilon|_2} \, , \, \hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0 \right\rangle = - \frac{1}{|\varepsilon|_2} \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T \varepsilon \, , \, \hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0 \right\rangle. \tag{17}$$

Combining (16) and (17), we get

$$- \frac{1}{|\varepsilon|_2} \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T \varepsilon \, , \, \hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0 \right\rangle \leq \sqrt{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} - \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j |u|_{(j)} \right),$$

which concludes the proof.

□

Lemma 5.3 *We have* $|\mathbb{X}(\hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0)|_2^2 \leq \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T \varepsilon \, , \, \hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0 \right\rangle + \mu\sqrt{n} |Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}^{SQL}|_2 |\hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0|_1$.

Lemma 5.4 *We have* $|\mathbb{X}(\hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0)|_2^2 \leq \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T \varepsilon \, , \, \hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0 \right\rangle + \sqrt{n} |Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}|_2 |\hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0|_*$.

Proof : We will give a general proof of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 in the case of an estimator defined by

$$\hat{\beta} := \arg\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |Y - \mathbb{X}\beta|_2 + ||\beta|| \right), \tag{18}$$

where $||\cdot||$ is a norm on $\mathbb{R}^p$. Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 are obtained as special cases corresponding to $||\cdot|| = \mu|\cdot|_1$ and $||\cdot|| = |\cdot|_*$. Denote by $||\cdot||_{dual}$ the norm dual to $||\cdot||$.

Since $\hat{\beta}$ is optimal, we know that $\mathbb{X}^T(Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta})/(\sqrt{n}|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}|_2)$ belongs to the subdifferential of the function $||\cdot||$ evaluated at $\hat{\beta}$. Thus, there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $||v||_{dual} \leq 1$ and

$$\frac{\mathbb{X}^T(Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta})}{\sqrt{n}|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}|_2} + v = 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$|\mathbb{X}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_0)|_2^2 = \left\langle \mathbb{X}^T\varepsilon \ , \ \hat{\beta} - \beta_0 \right\rangle + \sqrt{n}|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}_0|_2 \langle v \ , \ \hat{\beta} - \beta_0 \rangle.$$

The conclusion results from the inequality

$$\langle v \ , \ \hat{\beta} - \beta_0 \rangle \leq ||v||_{dual}||\hat{\beta} - \beta_0|| \leq ||\hat{\beta} - \beta_0||.$$

□

Lemma 5.5 *We have* $\gamma'\sqrt{(s/n)\log(2p/s)} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} \leq \gamma'\sqrt{(s/n)\log(2ep/s)}$.

Proof : From Stirling's formula, we deduce that $s\log(s/e) \leq \log(s!) \leq s\log(s)$. Therefore

$$s\log(2p/s) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s} \log(2p/j) = \log(2p) - \log(s!) \leq s\log(2ep/s).$$

The conclusion follows from the definition of the λ_j in (10).

□

The following simple property is proved in Giraud [8, page 112]. For convenience, it is stated here as a lemma.

Lemma 5.6 *With probability at least* $1 - (1 + e^2)e^{-n/24}$*, we have*

$$\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \frac{|\varepsilon|_2}{\sqrt{n}} \leq 2\sigma.$$

We will also use the following theorem from Bellec, Lecué and Tsybakov [1, Theorem 4.1].

Lemma 5.7 *Let* $0 < \delta_0 < 1$ *and let* $\mathbb{X}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ *be a matrix such that* $\max_{j=1,\dots,p} ||\mathbb{X}e_j||_n \leq 1$. *For any* $u = (u_1, \dots u_p)$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^p$*, we define :*

$$G(u) := (4 + \sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n, \quad H(u) := (4 + \sqrt{2})\sum_{j=1}^{p} |u|_{(j)}\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/j)}{n}},$$

$$\textit{and} \quad F(u) := (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\left(\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)}\right).$$

If $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{n\times n})$, then the random event

$$\left\{\frac{1}{n}\varepsilon^T \mathbb{X}u \leq \max\Big(H(u), G(u)\Big), \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^p\right\},$$

is of probability at least $1-\delta_0/2$.

Moreover, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have $H(u) \leq F(u)$, for all u in $\mathbb{R}^p$.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Lemma 5.7 allows one to control the random variable $\varepsilon^T\mathbb{X}u$ that appears in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.3 with $u := \hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0$. Our calculations will take place on an event of probability at least $1-\delta_0-(1+e^2)e^{-n/24}$, where both Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7 can be used. Applying Lemma 5.7, we will distinguish between the two cases : $G(u) \leq F(u)$ and $F(u) < G(u)$.

First case : $G(u) \leq F(u)$.

Then we have

$$(4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\left(\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)}\right).$$

We will show first that u is in the SRE cone, so that we can use the SRE assumption. From Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_{\mathcal{S}^C}|_1 &\leq |u_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + \frac{1}{\mu\sqrt{n}|\varepsilon|_2}\left\langle \mathbb{X}^T\varepsilon\ ,\ \hat{\beta}^{SQL} - \beta_0\right\rangle \\
&\leq |u_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}\mu|\varepsilon|_2} n\sigma(4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\left(\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)}\right) \\
&\leq |u_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + \frac{1}{4}\left(\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + |u_{\mathcal{S}^C}|_1\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we have used Lemma 5.6 and assumption (6). We deduce that

$$\frac{3}{4}|u|_1 \leq \frac{7}{4}|u_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{s}|u|_2 \leq \frac{7}{4}\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{s}|u|_2 = 2\sqrt{s}|u|_2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$|u|_1 \leq \frac{8}{3}\sqrt{s}|u|_2, \tag{19}$$

and thus, the following inequality holds $|u|_1 \leq (1+c_0)\sqrt{s}|u|_2$, with $c_0 = 5/3$, allowing us to use the $SRE(s, 5/3)$ assumption.

From Lemmas 5.3 and 5.7, and using that, in view of the $SRE(s,5/3)$ condition, $||\mathbb{X}u||_n \geq \kappa|u|_2$, we deduce that

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n^2 \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\left(\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)}\right) + \left(\frac{|\varepsilon|_2}{\sqrt{n}} + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n\right)\frac{8}{3}\mu\sqrt{s}|u|_2$$

$$\leq (4+\sqrt{2})\frac{11}{3}\sigma\sqrt{s\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\frac{||\mathbb{X}u||_n}{\kappa} + (2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)\,\frac{8}{3}\mu\sqrt{s}\frac{||\mathbb{X}u||_n}{\kappa}.$$

Thus,

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\frac{11}{3}\sigma\sqrt{s\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\frac{1}{\kappa} + (2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)\,\frac{8}{3}\mu\sqrt{s}\frac{1}{\kappa}.$$

Under assumptions (5) and (6), we have

$$\frac{8\mu\sqrt{s}}{3\kappa} = \frac{8\gamma}{3\kappa}\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}||\mathbb{X}u||_n &\leq 2\left(\frac{44+11\sqrt{2}}{3\kappa}\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)} + \frac{16\sigma\mu\sqrt{s}}{3\kappa}\right)\\ &\leq \frac{88+22\sqrt{2}+32\gamma}{3\kappa}\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)}. \qquad (20)\end{aligned}$$

We have proved in (19) that $|u|_1 \leq (1+c_0)\sqrt{s}|u|_2$, with $c_0 = 5/3$, so we get that $|u|_2 \leq ||\mathbb{X}u||_n/\kappa$. Therefore, we can deduce the following inequalities

$$|u|_2 \leq \frac{88+22\sqrt{2}+32\gamma}{3\kappa^2}\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)}, \qquad (21)$$

$$|u|_1 \leq \frac{704+176\sqrt{2}+256\gamma}{9\kappa^2}\sigma s\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)}. \qquad (22)$$

Second case : $F(u) \leq G(u)$.

Then we have

$$(4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(2p/s)}{n}}\left(\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)}\right) \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n.$$

Thus

$$|u|_1 \leq \sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{\log(2p/s)}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n.$$

From Lemmas 5.3 and 5.7, we find

$$\begin{aligned}||\mathbb{X}u||_n^2 &\leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n + \mu\left(\frac{|\varepsilon|_2}{\sqrt{n}} + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n\right)|u|_1\\ &\leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n + \mu\,(2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{\log(2p/s)}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}} + \mu\,(2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{\log(2p/s)}}.$$

We have chosen $\mu = 8\gamma\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{2p}{s}\right)}$ and $\delta_0 \geq (p/s)^{-s}$, which implies that

$$\log(1/\delta_0) \leq s\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right).$$

Thus

$$\mu\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{\log(2p/s)}} \leq \gamma\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\log(2p/s)}\sqrt{\frac{s\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}{\log(2p/s)}} \leq \gamma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq \frac{(4+\sqrt{2}+2\gamma)\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}}{1-\gamma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}} \leq (8+2\sqrt{2}+4\gamma)\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}, \tag{23}$$

where the second inequality follows from assumption (6). As a consequence, we have

$$|u|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{\log(2p/s)}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (8+2\sqrt{2}+4\gamma)\sigma s\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}.$$

We have also

$$\sqrt{s}|u|_2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}|u|_{(j)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{\log(2p/s)}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq \sqrt{s}||\mathbb{X}u||_n.$$

Thus

$$|u|_2 \leq ||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (8+2\sqrt{2}+4\gamma)\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}. \tag{24}$$

As a conclusion, we can prove the result (7) by combining the inequalities (20) and (23). The general bound for $|u|_q$, with $1 \leq q \leq 2$ is a consequence of the norm interpolation inequality $|u|_q \leq |u|_1^{2/q-1}|u|_2^{2-2/q}$ which proves (8).

□

5.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We act as in Section 5.2, with suitable modifications. We place ourselves in the event where both Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7 are valid, and set now $u := \hat{\beta}^{SQS} - \beta_0$. Applying Lemma 5.7, we will distinguish between the two cases : $G(u) \leq H(u) + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2}$ and $H(u) + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2} < G(u)$.

First case : $G(u) \leq H(u) + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2}$.

Applying Lemma 5.2, Lemma 5.7 and then Lemma 5.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|u|_* = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\lambda_j|u|_{(j)} &\leq 2\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j|u|_{(j)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}|\varepsilon|_2}\left\langle \mathbb{X}^T\varepsilon\ ,\ \hat{\beta}^{SQS}-\beta_0\right\rangle \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2}|u|_2 + \frac{n}{\sqrt{n}|\varepsilon|_2}\left((4+\sqrt{2})\frac{\sigma}{\gamma'}|u|_* + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2}\right) \\
&\leq 4\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2}|u|_2 + \frac{8+2\sqrt{2}}{\gamma'}|u|_*,
\end{aligned}$$

and we get

$$|u|_* \leq \frac{4|u|_2}{1-\frac{8+2\sqrt{2}}{\gamma'}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{s}\lambda_j^2},$$

Using assumption (11), we have $\gamma' \geq 16 + 4\sqrt{2}$, therefore $|u|_* \leq 8|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2}$. As a consequence, we get $u \in C_{WRE}(s, c_0)$ with $c_0 := 8$. Invoking Lemmas 5.4, 5.5, 5.7 and using the $WRE(s, c_0)$ condition, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
||\mathbb{X}u||_n^2 &\leq \frac{1}{n}\left\langle \mathbb{X}^T\varepsilon\ ,\ u\right\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}|Y - \mathbb{X}\hat{\beta}|_2|u|_* \\
&\leq (4+\sqrt{2})\frac{\sigma}{\gamma'}|u|_* + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} + (2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)|u|_* \\
&\leq \left((32+8\sqrt{2})\frac{\sigma}{\gamma'} + 17\sigma + 8||\mathbb{X}u||_n\right)|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} \\
&\leq \left((32+8\sqrt{2})\frac{\sigma}{\gamma'} + 17\sigma + 8||\mathbb{X}u||_n\right)\frac{||\mathbb{X}u||_n}{\kappa'}\gamma'\sqrt{(s/n)\log(2ep/s)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq \frac{\sigma}{\kappa'}\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2ep}{s}\right)}\frac{32+8\sqrt{2}+17\gamma'}{1-\dfrac{8\gamma'}{\kappa'}\sqrt{\dfrac{s}{n}\log\left(\dfrac{2ep}{s}\right)}}.$$

Applying condition (11), we obtain

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (64+16\sqrt{2}+34\gamma')\frac{\sigma}{\kappa'}\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2ep}{s}\right)}. \tag{25}$$

This and the WRE condition imply

$$|u|_2 \leq (64+16\sqrt{2}+34\gamma')\frac{\sigma}{\kappa'^2}\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2ep}{s}\right)}. \tag{26}$$

Therefore, using the inequality $|u|_* \leq 8|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2}$, we get from Lemma 5.5

$$|u|_* \leq 8(64+16\sqrt{2}+34\gamma')\gamma'\frac{\sigma}{\kappa'^2}\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{2ep}{s}\right). \tag{27}$$

Second case : $H(u) + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} \leq G(u)$.

Then we have

$$(4+\sqrt{2})\frac{\sigma}{\gamma'}|u|_* + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n.$$

Therefore we have

$$|u|_* \leq \gamma'\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n, \quad \text{and} \quad |u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n. \tag{28}$$

Invoking Lemmas 5.4 and 5.7, and using (28), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
||\mathbb{X}u||_n^2 &\leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n + \sigma|u|_2\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^s \lambda_j^2} + (2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)|u|_* \\
&\leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n + \sigma(4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n + (2\sigma + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n)\gamma'\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n.
\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq (8+2\sqrt{2}+2\gamma')\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}} + ||\mathbb{X}u||_n\gamma'\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}},$$

We have chosen $\delta_0 \geq (p/s)^{-s}$, which implies that

$$\frac{1}{n}\log(1/\delta_0) \leq \frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right). \tag{29}$$

We deduce that

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq \sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}\frac{8+2\sqrt{2}+2\gamma'}{1-\gamma'\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}}.$$

Applying condition (11), one can get that

$$||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq 2(8+2\sqrt{2}+2\gamma')\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}. \tag{30}$$

Therefore, we have from (28) and (29)

$$|u|_* \leq 2(8+2\sqrt{2}+2\gamma')\sigma\gamma'\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right), \tag{31}$$

Combining Lemma 5.5, (28), (29) and (30), we get

$$|u|_2\gamma'\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)} \leq (4+\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta_0)}{n}}||\mathbb{X}u||_n \leq 2(8+2\sqrt{2}+2\gamma')(4+\sqrt{2})\sigma\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right).$$

Finally, we get that

$$|u|_2 \leq \frac{2(8+2\sqrt{2}+2\gamma')(4+\sqrt{2})}{\gamma'}\sigma\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}. \tag{32}$$

□

Acknowledgement. This work is supported by the Labex Ecodec. The author thanks Professor Alexandre Tsybakov for helpful comments and discussions.

References

[1] Pierre C Bellec, Guillaume Lecué, and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Slope meets lasso: improved oracle bounds and optimality. *ArXiv preprint, arXiv:1605.08651*, 2016.

[2] Pierre C Bellec, Guillaume Lecué, and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Towards the study of least squares estimators with convex penalty. *ArXiv preprint, arXiv:1701.09120*, 2017.

[3] Pierre C Bellec and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Bounds on the prediction error of penalized least squares estimators with convex penalty. *ArXiv preprint, arXiv:1609.06675*, 2016.

[4] Alexandre Belloni, Victor Chernozhukov, and Lie Wang. Square-root lasso: pivotal recovery of sparse signals via conic programming. *Biometrika*, 98(4):791–806, 2011.

[5] Alexandre Belloni, Victor Chernozhukov, Lie Wang, et al. Pivotal estimation via square-root lasso in nonparametric regression. *Annals of Statistics*, 42(2):757–788, 2014.

[6] Peter J Bickel, Ya'acov Ritov, and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1705–1732, 2009.

[7] Małgorzata Bogdan, Ewout van den Berg, Chiara Sabatti, Weijie Su, and Emmanuel J Candès. Slope—adaptive variable selection via convex optimization. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 9(3):1103, 2015.

[8] Christophe Giraud. *Introduction to high-dimensional statistics*, volume 138. CRC Press, 2014.

[9] Guillaume Lecué and Shahar Mendelson. Regularization and the small-ball method i: sparse recovery. Technical report, CNRS, ENSAE and Technion, I.I.T., 2015.

[10] Benjamin Stucky and Sara van de Geer. Sharp oracle inequalities for square root regularization. *ArXiv preprint, arXiv:1509.04093v2*, 2016.

[11] Weijie Su and Emmanuel Candes. Slope is adaptive to unknown sparsity and asymptotically minimax. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(3):1038–1068, 2016.

[12] Tingni Sun and Cun-Hui Zhang. Scaled sparse linear regression. *Biometrika*, pages 1–20, 2012.

[13] Xiangrong Zeng and Mário A. T. Figueiredo. The ordered weighted ℓ_1 norm: Atomic formulation, projections, and algorithms. *ArXiv preprint, arXiv:1409.4271*, 2014.